

Marquess, Scott

From: Marquess, Scott
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:37 AM
To: Huffman, Diane
Subject: Pretty Prairie meeting summary

Diane,

Would you please take a look at my summary of the PP meeting, and let me know of any comments/changes. Thought we could share with Karen, DRWM, and CNSL, but I suppose the email to DRWM should come from you.

Scott

WENF met with Pretty Prairie officials on December 12 to discuss their long-standing non-compliance with the nitrate MCL. Below is a brief summary of the meeting:

Meeting Agenda was as follows:

Status of Pretty Prairie Public Water System

Pretty Prairie / KDHE / EPA
December 12, 2013; 1:00 – 3:00

Agenda

Introductions (All)

Why we are here (EPA)

Current Status

- Nitrate trends (EPA)
- Actions by Pretty Prairie? (Pretty Prairie)

Path Forward

- Is status quo an option? (EPA, discussion)
- 2007 Feasibility Study (discussion)
- Wellhead Protection Plan (discussion)
- Funding Options / SRF (KDHE, discussion)

Attendees - Pretty Prairie City council members, including mayor Seyb; City Clerk keeping minutes
Sid Arpin - Pretty Prairie engineering consultant
D. Plummer - KDHE
W. Carr, KDHE
D. Huffman, S. Marquess - EPA

The meeting discussion essentially followed the agenda. Huffman explained that EPA was interested in re-engaging with Pretty Prairie regarding their drinking water issues, indicating that NO3 levels in drinking water continued to increase,

that EPA was interested in any actions that PP had implemented over the past few years to address the problem, and that EPA was looking to develop a plan for moving forward.

Marquess added that NO₃ levels in PP's remaining active well had met or exceeded NO₃ levels in other wells that PP had previously deactivated, and were among the highest NO₃ levels in the state. EPA believes that actions are needed to abate nitrates.

PP indicated that they had not implemented any actions that would abate nitrates in their water supply.

EPA indicated that given the historical (20+ years) non-compliance and increasing NO₃ levels, the "status quo" was not really an option. PP did not dispute these issues, and added that their primary concern was the financial capability of the city to implement any capital improvements to their DW system.

Marquess briefly reviewed the 2007 Feasibility Study that PP was completed by an engineering firm, noting that the report was well written and comprehensive, and ultimately recommended that PP install centralized ion exchange treatment at a cost of approx \$1.2M (2007 basis).

The parties briefly discussed well head protection issues, noting that PP lies in a dense agricultural area. PP noted that many local farmers use nitrogen based fertilizers, but did not identify any single likely significant source/contributor to the nitrates in GW.

KDHE discussed funding options to PP, including the SRF and other sources (USDA-RD, Dept of Commerce CDBG), that PP may wish to pursue to fund necessary capital improvements to their DW system. During the meeting, PP completed a KDHE form to apply for a grant to complete a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER). The PER is a pre-requisite for obtaining SRF funding. PP was amenable and interested in considering funding alternatives to address the necessary system upgrades.

EPA concluded by indicating it was a goal for PP to develop a plan for moving forward to address the NO₃ problem by the spring of 2014, and to formalize such a plan by signing an agreement with KDHE or EPA to outline appropriate project deadlines. EPA encouraged PP to evaluate their funding options and to re-evaluate technical options (as described in the FS) and to contact EPA and/or KDHE with any questions.

In general, PP appeared to recognize their situation/non-compliance, were receptive to information that EPA and KDHE discussed, and willing to work towards finding an acceptable solution to address their non-compliance.

EPA is intending to contact PP by Feb 2014 to check on progress, and is drafting a short letter to PP to touch on the highlights of the meeting.